



Leon County Board of County Commissioners
Office of Management and Budget
Program Evaluation
Detailed Report

Program: Office of Growth and Environmental Management
Date Submitted: March 31, 2004

Attachment # 1
Page 2 of 36**Submitted To:**

Parwez Alam, County Administrator

Through:

Alan Rosenzweig, Director, Office of Management and Budget

Management Review Team:

Davin J. Suggs, Budget Manager

Kate West, Management and Budget Analyst

Maggie McGrath, Management and Budget Analyst

Emma Smith, Assistant to the Director, G.E.M.

Table of Contents

1.Executive Summary	Page 3
2.Background	Page 9
3.Scope and Objectives	Page 10
4.Methodology	Page 11
5.Findings, Recommendations, and Analysis	Page 12
6.Conclusion	Page 36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with actions taken at the May 27, 2003 Board meeting, the Office of Management and Budget performed a program evaluation of the Office of Growth and Environmental Management (G.E.M.), inclusive of all of its existing divisions. The following provides a summation of the findings and recommendations developed through the implementation of the County's program evaluation process

Response: Office of Growth and Environmental Management

On February 27, 2004 the Office of Growth and Environmental Management (the Office) transmitted a written response to the draft program evaluation report. The Office confirmed agreement or partial agreement with the following findings and recommendations: #'s 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

The Office did not confirm agreement with the following findings and recommendations: #'s 5, 9, 10, and 11. (Finding and Recommendation #10 has since been omitted from the report)

The detailed response from the Office has been integrated into the full program evaluation report.

Response: Other County Departments

On February 20, 2004 the Management Information Services division provided a written response the draft program evaluation report. MIS did not concur with finding and recommendation #6 (Finding and Recommendation #6 has since been omitted from the report). However, the division did confirm agreement or partial agreement with findings and recommendations #7 and #11. The division's response, as transmitted, has been integrated into the detailed program evaluation report.

Currently, at the date of submission of this report, the Human Resources department is evaluating the validity of those findings and recommendations involving the reclassification of current G.E.M. positions. Based upon the department's determination and the approval of those related recommendations, any recommended reclassifications will be addressed within the parameters of the appropriate budget development process.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

DEPARTMENT WIDE – OPERATIONS

Finding #1 The overall system of tracking and reporting performance measures is inadequate.

Recommendation #1 The following steps should be taken to improve the tracking and reporting of performance measures.

- One staff member, per division, should oversee or be responsible

for compiling and reporting the information.

- Each performance measure should be defined with regards to:
 1. Who will collect the data;
 2. How often the data will be collected and recorded;
 3. How the data will be collected (manually or automatic), and if any calculations are required; and
 4. How the data will be manipulated, including any assumptions, and any outcomes beyond the division's control.
- A centralized file (or system) for backup and supporting data should be developed. Staff should maintain a record of the data; establish consistency in the kind of report to be produced, as well as determine what variables are to be included when collecting, analyzing, and reporting on measures.

- Finding #2 The content of performance measures should be re-evaluated.**
- Recommendation #2** In conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, G.E.M. should re-evaluate the content of its current performance measures, for publication in FY 2005/2006, with consideration given to the following factors:
- It should be clearly stated and understood what categories of information each performance measure evaluates.
 - Outcomes should be measured as well as outputs.
 - A performance measure involving customer satisfaction should be included.
 - Include performance measures that better reflect the broad scope of the services and activities provided by the department.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

- Finding #3 The Permit Enforcement and Tracking System (P.E.T.S.) is effective; however, the system is not currently utilized to its fullest capacity.**
- Recommendation #3** G.E.M. division managers should continue to strongly encourage and motivate all applicable employees to utilize P.E.T.S. to its fullest capacity.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - FINANCIAL AND BUDGET

- Finding #4 The current (revenue) fee structure within the Growth Management Fund (Fund 121) does not support Growth Funding Ratio's approved by the Board of County Commissioners.**
- Recommendation #4** The current and projected growth revenues and expenditures should be re-evaluated and adjusted during the budget development period to meet Board approved goals.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

- Finding #5** **Current customer survey methods do not yield sufficient feedback**
- Recommendation #5 The department's current customer survey methods can be improved by:
- Utilizing a re-formatted customer satisfaction survey. *Note 4.0
 - Making the distribution of surveys a part of the department's standard operating procedure.
 - Entering the program/service area on the survey form prior to distributing them to customers.
 - Encouraging the customers to fill out and return the survey forms, beyond simply issuing the form.
 - Making available designated return boxes in several central locations throughout the building and advising customers of their location.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - GENERAL SERVICE DELIVERY

Finding #6 Omitted

- Finding #7** **The utility of the current G.E.M. website can be enhanced.**
- Recommendation #7 G.E.M., in conjunction with Management Information Services department, should work to implement the following improvements to the G.E.M. website:
- Reorganize the website to be more user-friendly and easy for new and unfamiliar customers to navigate.
 - Place all permit applications online and maintain updated versions to be available for customer download in a central location.
 - Application fees should be easily located on the website.
 - Enable customers to complete the customer satisfaction survey online.

- Finding #8** **The quality of service delivery provided by the department could be enhanced.**
- Recommendation #8a G.E.M. officials should work to develop cost effective strategies to improve its system routing telephone calls.
- Recommendation #8b The "G.E.M. Build-Out" capital project should facilitate efficient and effective work processes, while enhancing the quality of customer service provided.

SUPPORT SERVICES – OPERATIONS

- Finding #9** **The dual role of the Assistant to the Director may impact the effectiveness of the Code Compliance program.**
- Recommendation #9
- G.E.M. should consider evaluating and modifying the current

duties and responsibilities of existing Code Compliance staff to maximize efficiency; however, no new positions are required.

SUPPORT SERVICES - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #10 Omitted

Finding #11 The current structure of the Support Services division, with respect to information services support staff, promotes inefficiencies in the delivery of countywide management information services, and is inconsistent with other similar divisions and departments within the County.

Recommendation #11 Current information services support staff (not inclusive of records management staff) in G.E.M. should be re-organized and report to the M.I.S. department.

M.I.S. should commit to providing dedicated staff and resources to maintain current levels and quality of services necessary for G.E.M.

BUILDING INSPECTION - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #12 The minimum salary for Combination Inspectors may not be competitive.

Recommendation #12 G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of this class during the FY 2005 budget development period.

Finding #13 The minimum salary for the Plans Examiner, Building Inspection Supervisor, and the Deputy Building Inspector positions may not be competitive.

Recommendation #13 G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of this class during the FY 2005 budget development period.

BUILDING INSPECTION - FINANCIAL AND BUDGET

Finding #14 The current (revenue) fee structure within the Building Inspection Fund (Fund 120) will not support future Building Inspection operations.

Recommendation #14 The current fee structure supporting the Building Inspection Fund should be re-evaluated and adjusted during the appropriate County budget development period.
As a part of the fee review, OMB and the Building Inspection division should determine an appropriate level of fund balance to be maintained in the Building Inspection Fund (Fund 120).

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #15 The minimum salary for the Planner I, Planner II and Transportation Planner positions may not be competitive with the Leon County comparable county market average.

Recommendation #15 G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of this class during the FY 2005 budget development period.

Finding #16 The minimum salary for the Development Services Administrator and Development Services Supervisor positions may not be competitive.

Recommendation #16 G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of this class during the FY 2005 budget development period.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE – OPERATIONS

Finding #17 The discontinuation of the process involving in-field data collection for Natural Features Inventory-Limited Partition Subdivision (NFI-LP), and NFI-2.1.9.s needs to be considered.

Recommendation #17 G.E.M., in conjunction with the County Attorney's Office, should evaluate the continued provision of this service.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #18 The volume of special projects does substantially impact staff's ability to perform key daily job functions.

Recommendation #18 In order to alleviate the intervening workload caused by the current volume of special projects, the following should be considered:

- The addition of a Senior Environmental Engineer position should be further assessed during the FY 2005 budget development period.
- The active participation of the division in a college internship program should be further assessed during the FY 2005 budget development period.

Finding #19 The position title and classification of staff that is currently responsible for conducting Natural Features Inventory (NFI) does not accurately reflect job duties and skill set.

Recommendation #19 G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification and/or modification to the current

JDQ of this class, during the FY 2005 budget development period.

Finding #20 The minimum salary for the Senior Environmental Engineer, Environmental Review Supervisor, and Environmental Review Specialist positions may not be competitive with the Leon County comparable county market average.

Recommendation #20 G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources, should assess any potential reclassification of these classes during the FY 2005 budget development period.

Conclusion

Throughout the program evaluation process staff recognized a serious effort and commitment on the behalf of G.E.M. to provide efficient and effective services. Based on the data provided in the response from M.I.S., staff omitted finding and recommendation #6. Based on the data provided in the response from G.E.M., staff omitted finding and recommendation #10. However, staff does not concur with G.E.M.'s disagreement with findings and recommendations #5, #9, and #11, and as a result, these findings and recommendations are included in the report.

BACKGROUND

During the May 27, 2003 Board meeting, the Board approved the reorganization of the Community Development Group. The reorganization provided an opportunity to restructure certain elements within the Department to achieve greater efficiencies and enhance customer service as it relates to developmental and environmental concerns of the County.

Currently, the Community Development Department no longer exists. All housing and human service related functions were transferred to the Division of Health and Human Services. The Planning Department was reorganized within the Public Services Department. Finally, activities of the Neighborhood Justice Center were transferred to the Volunteer Services Division. Of the former Community Development Department, the remaining programs constitute what is now the Office of Growth and Environmental Management (G.E.M.).

In addition to the reorganization of the Community Development Department, the Board also approved the implementation of a comprehensive evaluation of the remaining programs of G.E.M.

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Per the Leon County Standard Program Evaluation Process ^{Note 1.0}, the programs of G.E.M. were evaluated within the scope of the following general core areas of concern:

(*Note 1.0: During calendar year 2003, the Office of Management and Budget developed a standardized program evaluation process to further efforts of continuously enhancing the quality of County services).

- A. Effectiveness and Efficiency of Operations;
This core area focuses on the actual service delivered by the program being evaluated. An assessment of the program within this scope will entail the analysis of what actual services the program provides and how well the program delivers these services.
- B. Effectiveness of General Management and Administration (Non-Financial);
Under the scope of this core area, activities related to personnel administration, procurement, organizational structure, policies and procedures, contract management, and other general administrative functions will be evaluated.
- C. Financial and Budget Administration;
The Financial and Administrative core area will provide for the assessment of the designated program with regards to past and current financial and budgetary performance. Analysis within this scope may be limited to revenues and expenditures, whether planned, budgeted, or actual. However, this area of the program evaluation will remain independent from any past, or future official financial audit performed by a non-Board entity.
- D. Customer Satisfaction;
Analysis influenced by the core area of Customer Satisfaction will focus on the recipients of the services being provided by the designated program. Within this scope, both internal and external customers and their relation to the services received will be evaluated.
- E. General Service Delivery / Innovation / or other special areas of concern
The focus of this core area is the service itself being delivered. Analysis within this scope will center on an evaluation of the validity of the service being offered, and potentially the cost-benefit analysis of the current delivery mechanism versus other potential delivery methods. Furthermore, this core area will provide for the evaluation of related best practices and innovative service delivery methods related to the designated program. Finally, this core area will focus on any special areas concern requested by the managing department, County Administration, and/or the Board of County Commissioners.

The overall objective is to evaluate potential opportunities, within the scope of this evaluation, to enhance the respective programs and services being evaluated.

METHODOLOGY

The overall methodology of the program evaluation consisted of three different phases. The three phases included:

- A. Preliminary Research, Planning, and Initiation;
- B. Assessment and Analysis; and
- C. Report Preparation.

Based on the overall methodology summarized above, the following tasks outline the work that was performed by the Program Evaluation Team. Some of the tasks may overlap with one another.

A. Preliminary Research and Planning

- Task One: Plan initial schedule, notify program/service area, and conduct entrance conference / kick-off meeting
- Task Two: Gather, compile, and review initial data and background information
- Task Three: Complete and refine detailed work plan

B. Assessment and Analysis

- Task Four: Perform assessment and analysis within the scope of the general core areas of concern
- Task Five: Develop initial findings
- Task Six: Clarify potential findings with program/service area managers

C. Report Preparation

- Task Seven: Draft final findings and recommendations
- Task Eight: Communicate findings and recommendations with program/service area and request official response
- Task Nine: Prepare report for final presentation

During the preliminary research and planning phases, as well as the assessment and analysis phase additional further detailed methods and techniques were utilized in fulfillment of the scope and objective of this program evaluation. These methods and techniques included, but were not limited to:

- ☐ Defining program purpose
- ☐ Defining general functions and responsibilities and other key aspects of operations
- ☐ Defining authority for intent and purpose of program and program activities
- ☐ Defining performance of program activities and functions
- ☐ Reviewing and evaluating findings / results / consequences of previous studies and reports
- ☐ Comparing and contrasting key operational aspects with similar jurisdictions
- ☐ Evaluating organizational climate
- ☐ Reviewing all policies and procedures of program
- ☐ Evaluating legal climate of program
- ☐ Evaluating all information management systems, processes and other general administrative procedures and systems
- ☐ Reviewing and documenting all appropriate advisory boards, committees, and commissions
- ☐ Reviewing and evaluating budgetary and financial aspects of program
- ☐ Evaluating customers/recipients of program services
- ☐ Reviewing potential "best practices" or other innovations regarding the particular method of service delivery related to program
- ☐ Reviewing and documenting other noted special areas of concern

FINDINGS, ANALYSIS, & RECOMMENDATIONS

DEPARTMENT WIDE – OPERATIONS

Finding #1: The overall system of tracking and reporting performance measures is inadequate. *Note 2.0

As a result of this assessment, staff identified that supporting documentation for currently published measures was not maintained in a centralized location and not easily retrievable. To varying degrees supporting documentation was not available for some of the published performance measures. When audited, often supporting documentation was not able to be manipulated for the replication of previously reported performance results. It was apparent that not all performance measure data for the Development Services division was accurately collected. Within the Environmental Compliance division there was a lack of communication among staff members responsible for collecting data.

Recommendation #1: The following steps should be taken to improve the tracking and reporting of performance measures.

- One staff member, per division, should oversee or be responsible for compiling and reporting the information.
- Each performance measure should be defined with regards to:
 1. Who will collect the data;
 2. How often the data will be collected and recorded;
 3. How the data will be collected (manually or automatic), and if any calculations are required; and
 4. How the data will be manipulated, including any assumptions, and any outcomes beyond the division's control.
- A centralized file (or system) for backup and supporting data should be developed. Staff should maintain a record of the data; establish consistency in the kind of report to be produced, as well as determine what variables are to be included when collecting, analyzing, and reporting on measures.

(*Note 2.0: Although it is recommended that all G.E.M. divisions implement recommendation #1 to the best of their ability, Finding #1 is specifically for the Support Services, Environmental Compliance, and Development Services divisions of G.E.M.)

G.E.M. Response:

Currently, the GEM Director of Support Services tracks the majority of the Support Services performance standards. The Assistant to the Director of Growth and Environmental Management tracks the performance standards for the Code Compliance Program. Performance measures are developed during the budget cycle, and the performance data is tracked throughout the year.

Data for Support Service is compiled monthly and reported annually. The Director of Support Services prepares the report for submittal to OMB, and keeps the compiled data. Records are maintained in hard copy for future use.

Within the Environmental Compliance Division, there are three distinct areas for which tracking and reporting of performance measures are necessary. The Inspection Supervisor covers Environmental Inspection Section, the Environmental Review Supervisor covers the Environmental Review Section and the Senior Environmental Compliance Specialist covers the Petroleum Storage Tank Section.

Performance measures are tracked by each of these individuals and compiled by the Administrative Associate V for the Division, and the Department Information Technology Manager for inclusion in the annual report.

Historically, the Environmental Review Section has had the most difficulty compiling the performance measures since many work processes were not in the Permits Tracking System (PETS). This will become easier due to the modifications made to PETS to include the routing for the Natural Features Inventory (NFI) and Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) processes. Continued PETS training will assist in proper input of required data.

Currently, the Development Services Division has two staff persons (Administrative Associate V and IV) that are responsible for coordinating, complying, and reporting the data that is presented in the annual performance report. Development Services has also designated staff based on programmatic responsibility that track and compile data that is specific to the applicable performance measure. The data that is collected is from PETS and backed-up in Excel spreadsheets in order to allow for data analysis requirements associated with other programmatic responsibilities such as concurrency management. However, due to the permitting based nature of PETS many of the Division's current planning and land use administration functions are not readily tracked by the software. Therefore, all data is supported by paper files that are project specific. All Development Services related files have been consolidated and moved to the Department's centralized records management system.

All the GEM divisions are continually working with the Department's in-house Support Services IT staff to refine and enhance PETS to improve its ability to track and analyze the various non-permitting and pre-permitting activities that constitute the primary responsibilities of the Department. GEM did provide OMB the performance standard records requested as a part of the program review. The Department will use the criteria

enumerated by OMB along with other methods to continue to improve and further refine the way the Department tracks and archives the performance standards for all the Department's Divisions. This has been and will continue to be an on-going process improvement for the Department.

Finding #2: The content of performance measures should be re-evaluated.

Staff observed that some of the department's measures were not clearly stated and did not clearly reflect what aspect of performance was being evaluated. Current measures tended to focus solely on outputs, and not outcomes. This fact was illustrated by the lack of measures reporting any information with regards to customer satisfaction levels. The choice of reported measures did not adequately reflect the broad scope of services and activities provided by the department.

- Recommendation #2: In conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, G.E.M. should re-evaluate the content of its current performance measures, for publication in FY 2005/2006, with consideration given to the following factors:
- It should be clearly stated and understood what categories of information each performance measure evaluates.
 - Outcomes should be measured as well as outputs.
 - A performance measure involving customer satisfaction should be included.
 - Include performance measures that better reflect the broad scope of the services and activities provided by the department.

G.E.M. Response:

GEM's current performance criteria was developed and approved by OMB as part of the County's 2000/2001 initiative to pair down performance standards so Departments were only focusing on the primary functions that they perform. GEM paired down performance standards accordingly, despite GEM disagreement with the new standards mandated by OMB. During the budget year GEM routinely reviews and revises division performance standards in accordance with this previous directive. These performance criteria are then submitted to OMB for consideration and incorporation into the budget. If OMB would like the Department to revise the current performance standards, we welcome that opportunity in light of past OMB directives that were not sufficient to meet GEM's needs, and would encourage feedback when drafting or revising the criteria from OMB.

GEM will work with OMB during the FY 05 budget cycle to improve the Department performance standards. An overall customer service measure will be developed to gauge customer satisfaction with services provided by the Department, and will be included in

the Administration and GEM Support Services performance measurement section of the budget.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #3: The Permit Enforcement and Tracking System (P.E.T.S.) is effective; however, the system is not currently utilized to its fullest capacity.

The Permit Enforcement and Tracking System (P.E.T.S.) utilized by G.E.M. is an effective management tool. However, staff identified weaknesses of P.E.T.S. which include the system being susceptible to user error^{*Note 3.0} and the level of difficulty in producing various reports in order to meet the demand of a variety of internal customers. There is still some resistance, from a minority group of G.E.M. staff members, to using P.E.T.S. for the manipulation and maintenance of data pertinent to some of the department's major functions and activities.

Recommendation #3: G.E.M. division managers should continue to strongly encourage and motivate all applicable employees to utilize P.E.T.S. to its fullest capacity.

(*Note 3.0: As with any system of this nature, this weakness may exist due to a high degree of required data entry;; however, tests of final data output reflected well on the department's system of monitoring the accuracy of data input by employees.)

G.E.M. Response:

Staff concurs with this assessment by OMB. PETS is an important tool in tracking and measuring the Department's permitting and approval process. GEM has an Office Automation Team (OAT) to encourage the use of PETS by all the Department Divisions so any Division within the Department can determine the status of a pending application. Management will continue to encourage employees to enter the required data needed to gauge the Department workload. OATS will continue to be utilized to gain employee input to make the data entry process more fluid.

Each division will continue to remind staff during the weekly staff meeting to utilize PETS to its fullest capacity. Annual evaluations now include a performance measure for data entry into PETS to provide feedback to staff. Continued PETS training will help in assisting staff to enter the data correctly. This has been and will continue to be an on-going process improvement for the Department.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - FINANCIAL AND BUDGET

Finding #4: The current (revenue) fee structure within the Growth Management Fund (Fund 121) does not support Growth Funding Ratio's approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

In November of 2001 the Board authorized G.E.M. to contract with Maximus to perform a service cost analysis and fee study. The final report illustrated that the Growth

Management Fund (Fund 121) was not recovering costs associated with processing and reviewing permit applications. Figure 1.0 below depicts that at the time of this study, the funding ratio of the Growth Management Fund (Fund 121) consisted of 62% General Fund subsidy and 38% growth fees. As a result of the Maximus study, new Growth fees were adopted at a September 17, 2002 Board meeting. The new fee structure was implemented on October 1, 2002. In adopting this new fee structure, the Board established a goal of maintaining a funding ratio within the Growth Management Fund (Fund 121) equal to 46% General Fund subsidy and 54% growth fees.

Figure 1.0 - Fund 121 Funding Ratios

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Growth Fees	38%	54%	49%	48%	47%	46%	46%
General Fund subsidy	62%	46%	51%	52%	53%	54%	54%

Figure 1.0 above shows that the year-end actual revenue totals for the Growth Management Fund (Fund 121) for FY 2002/2003 (first year implementation of new fees) resulted in a funding ratio equal to 46% General Fund subsidy and 54% growth fees. As of the end of FY 2003, G.E.M. had successfully implemented its new fee schedule and met funding goals established by the Board.

Although the new fee structure facilitated the maintenance of funding ratio goals for FY 2002/2003, staff estimates that these funding goals will not be met in FY 2004 and beyond. Figure 1.0 also illustrates the estimated funding ratio of the Growth Management fund (Fund 121) through FY 2008. Staff analysis has identified that a lack of consideration for inflation and trend data concerning the growth rate of fund expenditures may result in not maintaining established funding ratio goals.

Recommendation #4: The current and projected growth revenues and expenditures should be re-evaluated and adjusted during the budget development period to meet Board approved goals.

G.E.M. Response:

GEM's original 121-Growth Management Fund (GMF) FY 04 budget submittal did meet the approved 55/45 split; however, an increase in countywide program expenditures was approved by OMB during the budget cycle that caused the Board directed goal of a 55/45(fee/general revenue) split to be modified to a 50/50 split. This change was approved during the FY 04 budget development cycle, and GEM Management was unaware of the exact change in the split until the budget was finalized in September 2003. During the FY 04 budget development cycle the 121 GMF had to absorb, as did every other program in the County, an increase in the cost of health insurance. The 121 - GMF also had to absorb an increase in the budgeted indirect cost during this budget cycle. These increases in cost caused the fund to be budgeted at a 50/50 revenue split for FY 04.

The Board approved increases for Development Services and Environmental Compliance Review Fees on October 1, 2002, after a fee analysis done by Maximus indicated many fees were not recovering the Department's cost associated with providing the associated services. The Board did not approve all the fee increases as suggested by Maximus. Even though the fees were not increased to the extent proposed by Maximus, the new fee schedule for the 121- Growth Management Fund exceeded the revenue split approved by the Board with an actual 58/42 split for FY 03.

GEM anticipates that the directed 55/45 split is achievable during the current fiscal year, due in part, to the amount of lapsed salary dollars associated with the loss of a Senior Environmental Engineer in the Environmental Compliance Division. In addition, staff will look at instituting austerity spending measures on operating accounts if fee revenue projections continue to fall short of budgeted levels. During the first quarter the fund was approximately four percent behind in the collection of projected fee revenue. GEM will work with OMB during the budget cycle to review GEM's revenues and expenditure for the Growth Management Fund to achieve the 55/45 (fee/general revenue) goal set by the Board.

Other possible solutions are: conducting an updated fee analysis on the Growth Management Fund as previously recommended by Maximus; adjusting the GEM fees to an annual cost of living increase; reducing expenditures within the 121-GMF; or increasing the amount of general revenue provided to the fund. GEM will monitor revenue receipts and align expenses to meet the 55/45 split. As stated above, the use of lapse salary money as a means to cut expenses to maintain the 55/45 split should also be used as a means of meeting the Board mandated split.

If the split can not be achieved, an agenda will be presented to the Board. Furthermore, GEM will budget funds to perform a service cost analysis during FY 05 as recommended by Maximus for the FY 06 budget.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Finding #5: Current customer survey methods do not yield sufficient feedback.

There are two major obstacles to G.E.M. obtaining reliable customer satisfaction data. These include the survey instrument and the survey distribution method. The survey tool limits the ability of the customer to provide detailed feedback. It is very broad and general. The department currently distributes the surveys via the permit intake staff. This distribution mechanism fails to associate the service received and the provision of feedback by the customer. This distribution method, combined with the general characteristics of the survey instrument contribute to survey results often being skewed, not reflective of the various specialized services offered, and ultimately unreliable.

Recommendation #5: The department's current customer survey methods can be improved by:

- Utilizing a re-formatted customer satisfaction survey. *Note 4.0
- Making the distribution of surveys a part of the department's standard operating procedure.
- Entering the program/service area on the survey form prior to distributing them to customers.
- Encouraging the customers to fill out and return the survey forms, beyond simply issuing the form.
- Making available designated return boxes in several central locations throughout the building and advising customers of their location.

(*Note 4.0: During the review period, staff designed and formatted a new customer satisfaction survey for G.E.M. The adequacy of the survey was tested during a trial survey conducted by staff as a part of the program evaluation. G.E.M. staff received an opportunity to provide input on the design of the new survey, and upon acceptance of this recommendation it is expected that the new survey format will be further modified to fit G.E.M.'s specialized services.)

G.E.M. Response:

Past and current survey methods have yielded results that impacted and improved the Department's customer service. Department management has corrected staff as a direct result of complaints that were submitted on survey forms and later verified. Also, the Department also initiated an automated electrical release system, and modified permit application forms as a result of suggestions submitted on Department survey forms.

In March 2003 GEM revamped its survey distribution method to include handing out and encouraging customers to complete survey forms concerning their experience with the Department's services. Staff realized that the distribution of the survey forms could be improved and began distributing them in the Records and Contractors' Licensing Sections. The Department also distributed forms that could be mailed back to the Department by the customer; however, due to the low response rate, and the cost of bulk mail, the Department plans to abandon this method of collecting customer surveys.

Currently, the Department's Application Review Team is working with the form developed during the OMB program review to refine the survey to best collect customer service information. GEM will develop a plan to better collect data from all program areas in the Department through distribution and drop off points.

In addition, GEM would appreciate the opportunity to review the survey data collected and compiled by OMB to assist in the effort to improve the collection of customer satisfaction data.

DEPARTMENT WIDE - GENERAL SERVICE DELIVERY

Finding #6: THIS FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION HAS BEEN OMITTED FROM THE FINAL OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

Based on a recent survey of G.E.M. customers, a low percentage of customers actually utilize the Department's website.

Staff conducted a customer satisfaction survey of recent G.E.M. clientele. *Note 5.0 A portion of this survey provided respondents with an opportunity to comment on the G.E.M. website. An analysis of the survey illustrated that only about 30% of responding customers reported ever visiting the G.E.M. website.

Recommendation #6: G.E.M., in conjunction with the Public Information Office and the Management Information Services department, should develop multiple strategies to market the website to potential and existing customers.

(*Note 5.0: During the review period, staff designed and formatted a new customer satisfaction survey for G.E.M. The survey was distributed during a 14 day trial period as a part of this program evaluation. Customers responded to both written surveys while conducting business at the G.E.M. office facility and via the telephone as OMB staff members contacted a list of recent G.E.M. clients. In total 231 surveys were responded to by external customers of G.E.M.)

G.E.M. Response:

Staff is currently working with MIS to make the website more user friendly. In addition with the recent posting of Department public meetings, staff is working with MIS to create a direct link from the main County home page to the Department's Public Notice Site. Staff will also work with the Public Information Office to see where they can assist in making the public more aware of the GEM website.

It should also be noted that a formal roll-out with press coverage and displays in the Courthouse rotunda were used as means to advertise the website capabilities. Messages are on the telephone system advertise the website while customers are on hold. In addition, the Department began on-line permitting via "Velocity Hall" for over the counter permits in April 2003. An associated press and promotion in the "County Link" was coordinated with the Public Information Office.

The Department agrees with the additional recommendations as listed; however, improvements are needed on the website to make it more user friendly, and Department management will need to adjust the workload for the GEM IT personnel to allow the accomplishment of this goal.

M.I.S. / G.I.S. Response:

MIS/GIS believes the perceived "low" use of G.E.M.'s website is not valid. Many G.E.M. customers use the Permit Enforcement Tracking System (PETS) website to access information relevant to permitting, which is one of G.E.M.'s main functions. The

attached statistics for one of the permit websites indicate that the monthly average of visits by non-governmental users is now over 5,000. The newer permit website which allows on-line permitting applications is generating about 3,000 users a month. Although the Permit status page can be accessed from the G.E.M. page, most users access the Permit site directly or through the Property Appraiser's page or the Tallahassee-Leon County GIS page, thereby, bypassing the Department's page and causing the Department's page usage numbers to be lower.

Finding #7: The utility of the current G.E.M. website can be enhanced.

Staff found the G.E.M. website to be detailed and information intensive. Results from the customer satisfaction survey, conducted by staff, revealed that of those citizens that have visited the G.E.M. website, 83% found it helpful. However, staff observations include the recognition of the level of difficulty in navigating the website as a first-time user. All of the various permit applications are not located in a downloadable format on the website. Fee schedules are not easily obtainable within the site's current structure. Customers do not have the ability to download or complete a G.E.M. customer satisfaction survey online.

Recommendation #7: G.E.M., in conjunction with Management Information Services department, should work to implement the following improvements to the G.E.M. website:

- Reorganize the website to be more user-friendly and easy for new and unfamiliar customers to navigate.
- Place all permit applications online and maintain updated versions to be available for customer download in a central location.
- Application fees should be easily located on the website.
- Enable customers to complete the customer satisfaction survey online.

G.E.M. Response:

GEM's current website was developed in 1999 in conjunction with a one-stop permitting grant from the State of Florida. When the website (leonpermits.org) came on-line, GEM had one of the most comprehensive Leon County web pages.

At the October 2003 GEM/MIS Coordination Meeting GEM requested that their website be updated to reflect the new County web design. The new web design was put in place to update the look of the County page, and to make it easier for people to navigate the site. MIS was currently completing the Public Works Department's home page and informed GEM Support Services staff that GEM was the last Department to be updated, due to the comprehensive information already found on the site. Since November 2003 GEM staff has coordinated with MIS to update the GEM website to make it easier to navigate for information.

Department applications are posted on the site as specified in the Application Review Teams Final Report and Recommendations dated March 2003. Applications are routinely updated and posted on the site. Currently, the applications are only available in PDF format. GEM is working with MIS to allow the use of password protected Word applications to prevent the public from modifying Department applications and affidavits. The applications will be easier to locate on the site when the new format is completed by MIS.

The GEM fee schedule is located on the site in more than one location. The location of the fee schedule will be highlighted when MIS completes the conversion of the current page.

Posting a customer survey on the site can also be addressed with MIS during the updating of the GEM website.

M.I.S. / G.I.S. Response:

MIS/GIS believes all websites should be in a continual process of enhancement for easier use, improved services, and updated information. Note that G.E.M. has had online permitting for over a year for simple permits through the Joint City/County Velocity Hall implementation. There is an action plan to add more complex permits to the online service.

Finding #8: The quality of service delivery provided by the department could be enhanced.

There are two significant impediments to the department's ability to maximize the quality of service provided to its customers. The first is the current switchboard telephone system. Presently, all telephone calls entering the department are routed through the front intake area. Call volume averages about 300 – 500 calls a day which presents a significant workload for employees stationed in this area. Additionally, if calls are not transferred to voicemail, employees are frequently paged on an "all call" intercom system. This action is disruptive to both employees of G.E.M. and customers present in the office facility.

The G.E.M. office facility limits the department's ability to provide an enhanced level of service. The layout of the current G.E.M. facility is not conducive to work processes and seriously limits the quality of customer service provided by the department. There is a capital improvement project budgeted that includes funding for some renovations of the office facility. The original focus of this project is the renovation of space once occupied by the Supervisor of Elections, modifications related to the Americans with Disabilities Act, and other minor modifications.

Recommendation #8a: G.E.M. officials should work to develop cost effective strategies to improve its system routing telephone calls.

Recommendation #8b: The "G.E.M. Build-Out" capital project should facilitate efficient and effective work processes, while enhancing the quality of customer service provided.

G.E.M. Response:

GEM has and will continue to look at ways to improve the system of routing calls. Last year GEM requested that MIS look at updating the phone system to include some voice automation features, such as the ability for customers to select a phone extension before going to the operator. Current policy dictates that a person answers the phone for all incoming calls. Intake staff tries to minimize the use of the Department all call, but sometimes the practice is necessary to ensure prompt customer service. The Department reception staff receives, on average, 300 or more telephone calls a day, while receiving clients in the lobby. Managing that level of telephone calls is extremely challenging and Board policy makes it difficult to handle this call volume with the amount of personal contact required for every telephone call.

The Department requests that County Administration review the policy regarding the use of direct line calling. Direct call capability would reduce the direct switchboard traffic, help reduce the number of "all calls", and allow for enhanced customer service in the reception area.

The current programming for the GEM renovations addresses the concerns of handling customers in a more professional setting. The lobby will be expanded, and conference rooms for Department Duty Officers are being added off of the lobby area to allow staff more efficient access to the customer. GEM staff in conjunction with Facilities Management will continue to look for ways to improve the design for customer service circulation during the final programming of the office space. GEM staff has been waiting for 3 years to implement these customer service capital project improvements. We have recognized the need to make customer service capital project improvements for a number of years and in 2001 we worked with a consultant to design those improvements. Since then, we have been waiting on the Board to make decisions concerning the location of GEM.

SUPPORT SERVICES – OPERATIONS

Finding #9: The dual role of the Assistant to the Director may impact the effectiveness of the Code Compliance program.

Currently the Assistant to the Director of G.E.M. serves in two major capacities. As the Assistant to the Director, the position plays an integral part in the day to day operations of the entire department. The position also serves as the program manager of the Code Compliance program. The duties required of the position, in support of the Director, involve numerous special projects ranging from the coordination of reports, special studies, and requests from the Board, to the bi-weekly coordination, facilitation, and preparation of the department's agenda items for Board meetings. With regards to available staff time, the fulfillment of these duties often conflict with the responsibilities

as a program manager for Code Compliance. The staffing plan for the Code Compliance program does not include any personnel with duties of running the program on a day to day basis, with minimal oversight by the "Assistant To" position. Staff is aware that G.E.M. has explored this issue in the past, but only through the means of requesting a new position.

Recommendation #9: G.E.M. should consider evaluating and modifying the current duties and responsibilities of existing Code Compliance staff to maximize efficiency; however, no new positions are required.

G.E.M. Response:

The Assistant to the Director does not handle numerous special projects ranging from the coordination of reports, special studies and requests from the Board as stated in this report. As stated in the position JDQ, special projects are coordinated for administrative, operational and policy, which are minimal and not numerous. The special projects outlined in this section are actually handled more so by the Director of GEM Support Services or the Department Director. Furthermore, the position duties do not conflict with the responsibilities as a program manager for Code Compliance as stated in the report. The work tasks for this position are monitored on a monthly basis by the Director to ensure that the workload is not overwhelming. In that same light, it is vital that this position, which also serves as the Department's Ombudsman, have close association with the Director to keep him informed about internal and code complaints, for this reason it is critical that the Assistant To position serve a vital role in the day to day operation of the program to ensure objectivity. Due to the increasing workload in this area, GEM has requested a new Code Compliance Supervisor position during the 2004-05 Fiscal Year.

Staff has analyzed the staffing of the Code Compliance Program and as a result, a new Code Compliance Supervisor position has been requested for FY 05. This is due to the increased volume of complaints, and the need to discontinue the use of the Planner I position in the Development Services Division in determining zoning code violations. Due to this findings error in analyzing the duties of the Assistant To position, we disagree with the associated recommendations.

Finding #10: THIS FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION HAS BEEN OMITTED FROM THE FINAL OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

The Code Compliance program should be structured as an independent program of G.E.M.

Staff has assessed that the Code Compliance program is designed to be independent from the other major functions of G.E.M. This is a major reason why the Assistant to the Director also serves as the program manager. However, the Code Compliance program is

currently budgeted and accounted for in the Support Services division. The structure is inconsistent with the intended independence of the Code Compliance program.

Recommendation #10: Restructure the Code Compliance program as an independent unit of G.E.M. and separate from the Support Services division.

G.E.M. Response:

There is no need to restructure the Code Compliance Program. The present independent structure from the other GEM regulatory divisions provides objectivity and fast response to complaints. Establishing an independent/separate unit will slow the response time to effectively handle complaints. The Code Compliance Program is structured as a separate program from the GEM divisions as reflected in the organization chart. The Contractor's Licensing Board was under the Building Inspection

Division and the Code Enforcement Board was under the Environmental Enforcement Division prior to reorganization in 1995. This change was made to improve the objectivity of the Code Compliance Program by moving those Boards under the direction of the Department Director and to speed up response time to handle complaints. Furthermore, a position was reclassified to the Assistant To position to manage this program and serve as Ombudsman to report directly to the Department Director to enhance the effectiveness of the program.

Furthermore, the report fails to recognize the operational use of the Environmental Compliance Inspectors in the Environmental Compliance Division, the Building Inspectors in the Building Inspection Division and the Planner I in the Development Services Division that serve as the first responders to inspect code complaints. Structured in an independent program would diminish the effectiveness of the Code Compliance Program due to a lack of continuity with the Environmental Compliance, Development Services and Building Inspection Divisions. We disagree with this recommendation.

The Code Compliance Program is budgeted under the Support Services Division due to the directive of the County Administrator to consolidate administrative units under one budget code and eliminate excessive budget codes. We support this change at the direction of the County Administrator.

SUPPORT SERVICES - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #11: The current structure of the Support Services division, with respect to information services support staff, promotes inefficiencies in the delivery of countywide management information services, and is inconsistent with other similar divisions and departments within the County.

G.E.M. possesses its own information services unit. The unit, as a part of the Support Services division, provides technical assistance to the entire G.E.M. department in the

form of basic computer systems support, support for P.E.T.S as well as other applications, and geographic information systems support. The current structure arose from the need of a high level of specialized technical support and past inefficiencies in receiving this support from the Management Information Services (M.I.S.) department.

At the time of this review, the structure and operation of the M.I.S. department is positioned to effectively provide the specialized services required by G.E.M. While G.E.M. has enjoyed and benefited from the independence of its own information services support team, it has also suffered from the inability to provide adequate amounts of ongoing training and continuing education (due to budget constraints). The structure at G.E.M. creates an environment for actions, policies, and procedures inconsistent with established Countywide M.I.S goals, objectives, and principles. This serves as an undesirable contradiction to the intended centralized role of the M.I.S. department. Further existence of the structure potentially promotes the opportunity for organizational-wide inefficiencies for the M.I.S. department in the countywide provision of information management services and products.

Recommendation #11a: Current information services support staff (not inclusive of records management staff) in G.E.M. should be re-organized and report to the M.I.S. department.

Recommendation #11b: M.I.S. should commit to providing dedicated staff and resources to maintain current levels and quality of services necessary for G.E.M.

G.E.M. Response:

The current Information Technology and Geographical Information System positions serve the Department well in the current organizational structure, and placing these positions under the direction of MIS may hinder the day-to-day operations of GEM. Without specificity it is difficult for GEM management to discern how the current organizational structure interferes with MIS carrying out countywide services. In fact, the current structure allows MIS to focus their Department's resources in other areas due to GEM's self-sufficiency in monitoring, running, and upgrading the day-to-day Department computer operations. For example, during the recent Countywide

Microsoft 2000 operating system upgrade, GEM IT staff upgraded all of GEM's operating systems after MIS provided initial instructions. This allowed MIS to focus their labor efforts in other County Departments.

GEM is one of the largest users of the County MIS/GIS computer network system, and the Department is located remotely from MIS/GIS Central. The current organizational structure that has IT and GIS personnel on-site at GEM, and funded in the GEM budget, was developed after it was recognized that MIS could not assure GEM of a timely response to system upgrades and repairs. There tended to be competing priorities, and often personnel and resources that were assigned to assist GEM with network applications were diverted to other MIS projects. There is no assurance as specified in

OMB's recommendation that MIS will be able to provide the same level of service if staff is placed under the purview of MIS.

In addition, the IT Manager is the supervisor of the Records Management Section, a reorganization that was approved in the FY 04 budget. The IT Manager supervising records staff provides continuity with the integration of the Electronic Data Management imaging initiative of the Department records, and the associated linkage between the PETS data base.

Ability to Respond to Network and Equipment Problems

Since the time GEM has staffed IT personnel, the Department has become more dependent on the County network and the proprietary software used to schedule inspections and track permits. This situation mandates that IT personnel be on-site in case a system has an outage, and/or equipment fails. The current system allows for personnel to immediately respond to reported problems such as PETS not running the necessary and critical inspection reports. In addition, if there is equipment failure or problems with desktop components on-site staff can immediately respond and initiate repairs. Furthermore, MIS will see an increase in the Help Desk calls from GEM if IT staff are transferred which would add workload to the Help Desk.

Setting Work Priorities

Currently, broad work priorities are set by the GEM Support Services Division Director. The IT Manager coordinates the implementation of priorities and delegates assignments to staff. Priority requests often come from other divisions, and their requests are accommodated on a priority need basis.

It is paramount that the setting and monitoring of Department work priorities remain with the Department. If another Department, such as MIS, controls and sets the internal IT specific work priorities that allow GEM to operate efficiently, then conflicts may occur that could cause organizational inefficiency. This is especially true with the Department's utilization of PETS and the GIS system.

Positions funded by the GEM-121 and Building-120 Funds

The current budget funds the IT manager and Computer Support Specialist from both the Growth Management and Building Funds at 69/39 percent respectively. The GIS Specialist II position is funded 100 percent by the Growth Management fund. Transferring these positions to MIS would put additional funding requirements on the General Revenue Fund. Keeping the positions within the 120 and 121 Funds allows some of the fees charged for permits to cover some of the costs associated with GEM's technology needs.

Similarly, the City of Tallahassee Growth Management Department budgets and supports six IT positions: two involved with administering the Permits Tracking System and

associated hardware, a GIS specialist, and three imaging technicians. This allows City Growth Management to have technical representation on the PETS Development Team, internal control over the reports generated from the PETS data base, and representation on the GIS interlocal development team. The City Information Systems Department supports this technical staff.

Increase in Indirect Costs to the GEM 120 Building and 121 Growth Management Funds

Placing the current IT staff under MIS will increase the Department's indirect cost allocation to MIS as a central service provider. Currently, internal hardware and software problems are dealt with by GEM IT staff without calls being reported to the MIS Help Desk. More GEM calls to the Help Desk will add additional service units to GEM's calculated indirect cost from MIS which could cause additional reliance on general revenue, or cause the Department to increase service fees to cover the cost of the additional indirect.

PETS Development Team and GIS Interlocal Representation

GEM is currently represented on the PETS Development Team which reviews and makes recommendations concerning the technical aspect of administering the permit tracking data base by the Department IT manager. Moving the position to MIS would essentially remove the Department's technical representation from the Development Team. City Growth Management is represented on the technical team by an IT position that works for the Growth Management Department. In order to maintain GEM's technical representation on the Development Teams, the Department would recommend that the position stay funded by the Department. Having MIS staff represent GEM's technical needs would not ensure that the internal work processes necessary to efficiently conduct the Department's business would be best represented.

Conflicting Chain of Command

Currently, IT staff is under the direction of the Director of GEM Support Services. Under the proposed scenario of placing all of GEM's IT positions under the domain of MIS, but within the GEM work setting would likely cause conflict and confusion between GEM and MIS management and associated technical staff with regard to the setting of work priorities. Confusion regarding the supervision of MIS staff has happened in the past with the assignment of MIS OPS staff to GEM.

Also, MIS would be charged with evaluating the employees, but would not have the necessary daily or even weekly contact with the individuals to perform the necessary and meaningful employee evaluations.

Setting work priorities could also become an issue if MIS has additional projects and for some reason becomes short staffed. The Department's workload and demand on the IT and GIS staff is such that any confusion regarding work priorities or chain of command

could cause unnecessary disruption in services to the Department external and internal customers.

Competing GEM and MIS Priorities

This change could have a detrimental impact on GEM ability to deliver services to the customer and provide staff with the tools and resources to perform their jobs. Without any definite assurances that GEM would be able to have an acceptable level of supervision, it is difficult to support this recommendation.

GEM dependence on the use of the computer is very high, and with priorities changing on a constant bases, the ability for GEM management to provide directives to GEM IT staff is vital. Often, decisions are required by the Department or Support Services Director in deciding which competing priorities from GEM Divisions are to be addressed first with regard to IT work assignments.

The proposed recommendation by OMB does not address whose decision making authority would be used in competing priority situations. In addition, there is little assurance that MIS will not have competing priorities and deadlines that conflict with the immediate needs of GEM. If MIS's priorities do not mesh with the service delivery needs of GEM, then the customer service that the Department provides could suffer.

M.I.S. / G.I.S. Response:

In principle, MIS/GIS supports a centralized information management organization. Currently MIS/GIS staff are permanently assigned and housed at the Main Library, Court Administration, and Emergency Medical Services. MIS/GIS have found that assigning dedicated staff to customer locations, where warranted, provides quality and timely services. The staff have assigned MIS supervisors and are involved in team and project meetings with other MIS/GIS personnel. The staff have the benefit of learning what best practices are expected and assures that proper procedures, documentation, and logging are followed for organizational objectives such as security, disaster recovery and business continuity, and ongoing improvements. Additionally, these staff members have access to training and ongoing education within the MIS/GIS training programs for staff development.

This model is followed in the GIS area at the City. GIS Specialists are assigned and housed at specific departments, yet report to the ISS GIS Coordinator, who in turn works as a direct liaison to the TLCGIS Coordinator at the County. This structure allows the specific departments to have dedicated resources that are in tune with the program-wide objectives and processes, which eliminates redundancies, streamlines business processes, and promotes intra-departmental interactions.

BUILDING INSPECTION - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #12: The minimum salary for Combination Inspectors may not be competitive.

The current Leon County pay grade minimum for the position of Combination Inspector is \$29,956. As defined by current County policy and the Human Resources department, competitiveness is considered to be at least "5% above competitive market average." In performing a comparative compensation analysis, staff surveyed a combination of "Like-Sized" counties*^{Note 6.0} commonly used in various comparative budget analyses. As a result of these efforts, staff determined that the current pay grade minimum for County Combination Inspectors is 12% less than the average pay grade minimum of those entities surveyed.

Recommendation #12: G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of this class during the FY 2005 budget development period.

(*Note 6.0: "Like-Sized" Counties surveyed include Alachua County, Escambia County, Seminole County, and Marion County.)

G.E.M. Response:

Staff concurs with this recommendation and will pursue reclassification of these positions through Human Resources in the FY 05 budget cycle. This has been the position of the Department for years and we have made numerous requests to Human Resources for salary increases for these positions. There have been some approvals in salary increases over the years, but not to the point of keeping pace with the salary increases in other government jurisdictions. This is due in large part to increased state licensure requirements for these positions. Leon County has lost seven employees from these positions to competing jurisdictions upon becoming properly trained and state licensed. This lack of experienced staff significantly increases the chance of building code violations being missed, thus leading to an increased danger of injury, and or death to the inhabitants of the built environment.

Finding #13: The minimum salary for the Plans Examiner, Building Inspection Supervisor, and the Deputy Building Inspector positions may not be competitive.

The current Leon County pay grade minimum for the positions of Plans Examiner, Building Inspection Supervisor, and Deputy Building Inspector is \$32,624, \$39,347, and \$39,347 respectively. As defined by current County policy and the Human Resources department, competitiveness is considered to be at least 5% above competitive market average. In performing a comparative compensation analysis, staff surveyed a combination of "Like-Sized" counties*^{Note 7.0} commonly used in various comparative budget analyses. As a result of these efforts, staff determined that the current pay grade minimum for the Plans Examiner and the Deputy Building Inspector is 7% and 22% respectively less than the average pay grade minimum of those entities surveyed. While the Building Inspection Supervisor is 4% above the market average, it is not considered competitive because it is not 5% above the market average.

Recommendation #13: G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of the classes during the FY 2005 budget development period.

(*Note 7.0: "Like-Sized" Counties surveyed include Alachua County, Seminole County, Collier County and Marion County.)

BUILDING INSPECTION - FINANCIAL AND BUDGET

Finding #14: The current (revenue) fee structure within the Building Inspection Fund (Fund 120) will not support future Building Inspection operations.

In November of 2001 the Board authorized G.E.M. to contract with Maximus to perform a service cost analysis and fee study. The final report illustrated that the Building Inspection Fund (Fund 120) was not recovering costs associated with processing and reviewing permit applications. At a September 17, 2002 Board meeting, the Board decided to defer implementing recommended fee increases due to an existing \$916,243 fund balance in the fund.

Upon assessment of the Building Inspection fund (Fund 120), staff estimates that the fund will not be able to maintain its self-sustaining status by FY 2007. Figure 2.0 illustrates staff's projections of the status from FY 2002 through FY 2008. As shown in the figure, it is apparent that an increase in building fees needs to be addressed in order to maintain the self-sustaining status of the fund. Staff is currently aware of the fact that Building Inspection management has identified this issue as a priority, and is working towards developing possible solutions.

Figure 2.0 - Fund 120 Revenue and Expenditure estimates

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Beginning Balance	\$1,042,873	\$916,243	\$868,864	\$689,912	\$469,614	\$212,814	(\$69,378)
Revenues *Note 8.0	1,042,326	1,090,470	1,036,052	1,057,419	1,078,244	1,097,586	1,119,538
Expenditures	1,168,956	1,137,849	1,215,004	1,277,717	1,335,044	1,379,778	1,452,107
Ending Balance	916,243	868,864	689,912	469,614	212,814	(69,378)	(401,947)

(*Note 8.0: In accordance with Florida Statutes, the revenue estimates, used in this analysis for FY 2004 through FY 2008 are displayed at 95% of the actual projections provided by the Building Inspection division.)

Recommendation #14a: The current fee structure supporting the Building Inspection Fund should be re-evaluated and adjusted during the appropriate County budget development period.

Recommendation #14b: As a part of the fee review, OMB and the Building Inspection division should determine an appropriate level of fund balance to be maintained in the Building Inspection Fund (Fund 120).

G.E.M. Response:

It should be clarified that as an enterprise fund, the fund balance has successfully supported any shortage in revenue for a number of years, and at the beginning of FY 04 had a fund balance of \$868,864. Building Inspection management will continue to work with OMB to reevaluate the current building permit fee schedule (which has remained unchanged since 1995), and the need for a fee increase in the appropriate out year based on future revenues collected and the 120 Fund balance at that time (current estimates suggest that may be FY 06 or FY 07).

Building Inspection management will continue to work with OMB to determine the appropriate amount for the 120 Fund balance.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #15: The minimum salary for the Planner I, Planner II and Transportation Planner positions may not be competitive with the Leon County comparable county market average.

The current Leon County pay grade minimum for the positions of Planner I, Planner II and Transportation Planner is \$25,427, \$32,625, and \$35,450 respectively. As defined by current County policy and the Human Resources department, competitiveness is considered to be at least 5% above competitive market average. In performing a comparative compensation analysis, staff surveyed a combination of "Like-Sized" counties*^{Note 9.0} commonly used in various comparative budget analyses. As a result of these efforts, staff determined that the current pay grade minimum for Planner I, Planner II and Transportation Planner is 26%, 17%, and 12% respectively less than the average pay grade minimum of those entities surveyed.

Recommendation #15: G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of this class during the FY 2005 budget development period.

(*Note 9.0: "Like-Sized" Counties surveyed include Alachua County, Seminole County, Manatee County, and Marion County.)

G.E.M. Response:

Staff concurs with this recommendation and support the reclassification of the positions identified by OMB in order for the County to provide a competitive salary. This has been staff's position for a number of years. Under the current salary structure, the ability of the County to hire and retain qualified planning professionals is extremely difficult. This has resulted in the Division's planning positions remaining vacant for excessive periods

resulting in increased staff workload, decreased staff morale, and a negative impact on delivery of customer service.

Presently, Development Services staff is working with staff from Human Resources to update and revise the JDQs for the Division's planning positions. After the JDQs review and revision process is completed, HR staff will be completing comparative market salary studies and providing recommendations with regard to appropriate compensation for the position in question.

Finding #16: The minimum salary for the Development Services Administrator and Development Services Supervisor positions may not be competitive.

The current Leon County pay grade minimum for the positions of Development Services Administrator and Development Services Supervisor is \$43,665 and \$38,634 respectively. As defined by current County policy and the Human Resources department, competitiveness is considered to be at least 5% above competitive market average. In performing a comparative compensation analysis, staff surveyed a combination of "Like-Sized" counties*^{Note 10.0} commonly used in various comparative budget analyses. As a result of these efforts, staff determined that the current pay grade minimum for Development Services Administrator and Development Services Supervisor is 7% and 20% respectively less than the average pay grade minimum of those entities surveyed.

Recommendation #16: G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification of this class during the FY 2005 budget development period.

(*Note 10.0: "Like-Sized" Counties surveyed include Alachua County, Seminole County, Manatee County, and Marion County.)

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE – OPERATIONS

Finding #17: The discontinuation of the process involving in-field data collection for Natural Features Inventory-Limited Partition Subdivision (NFI-LP), and NFI-2.1.9.s needs to be considered.

A Natural Features Inventory (NFI) is the identification of environmentally significant features on a parcel of land that is proposed for development or subdivision. Environmentally significant features include wetlands, waterbodies, watercourses, floodplain, native forest, and habitat of endangered plants and animals. In addition to identifying environmentally sensitive features, the NFI also identifies regulatory issues that are sufficiently significant to have an impact on the development potential of a parcel, such as canopy roads.

The standard NFI is performed and surveyed by a qualified professional retained by the property owner or their agent. The work is then submitted for review by a County Environmental Review Specialist who confirms the presence and location of the

environmentally significant features. However, the NFI for Limited Partitions (NFI-LP) and the NFI for 2.1.9 subdivisions (NFI-2.1.9) are performed by a County Environmental Review Specialist.

Staff has determined that the practice of County staff collecting in-field data for the purpose of conducting a Natural Features Inventory (NFI) is not shared by other comparable jurisdictions^{*Note 11.0}. Among those comparable jurisdictions, justification for not conducting NFI's includes concern for the fact that the entity in control of collecting the environmental data is also responsible for determining the applicant's compliance with environmental regulations. In other jurisdictions data collection services are commonly provided by private entities or consultants. This is true for all types of required County NFI's with the exception of the NFI-LP and NFI-2.1.9.

Recommendation #17: G.E.M., in conjunction with the County Attorney's Office, should evaluate the continued provision of this service.

(*Note 11.0: Comparable jurisdictions include the City of Tallahassee, Manatee County, Sarasota County, and Orange County.)

G.E.M. Response:

Staff concurs with this recommendation to work with the County Attorney's Office to determine the level of liability. This is also a matter of the level of customer service that the Department will provide compared to the level of liability incurred by the Department. The primary reason for staff performing the NFI work for the LP and 2.1.9 applications was to keep the costs down for the smaller "mom and pop" property owner, many of which do not have the financial resources of a developer to hire consultants to perform this work. County preparation of NFIs could open the County to liability concerns and could be considered an inherent conflict of interest. The decision on this issue will be based on a balance between the level of customer service and the level of liability. The ultimate decision should be made by the County Administrator and the Board.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE - GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Finding #18: The volume of special projects does substantially impact staff's ability to perform key daily job functions.

The Environmental Compliance division experiences a significant volume of special projects. Based on extensive document review, staff has determined that special projects include, but are not limited to, activities or assignments not directly related to the review of proposed land development projects. Staff has assessed that the Environmental Compliance division is unable to fully accomplish several primary job duties due to intervening special projects workload. The Director of Environmental Compliance is estimated to spend as much as 75% of his time preparing for and implementing special projects. However, the position's job description states that roughly 30% of the position's time should be dedicated to special projects. Furthermore, the intervening workload also inhibits several other key positions, within the division, from performing

regular job duties. Some of these positions include the Environmental Review Supervisor and a Senior Environmental Engineer.

Recommendation #18: In order to alleviate the intervening workload caused by the current volume of special projects, the following should be considered:

- The addition of a Senior Environmental Engineer position should be further assessed during the FY 2005 budget development period.
- The active participation of the division in a college internship program should be further assessed during the FY 2005 budget development period.

G.E.M. Response:

Staff concurs with this recommendation, and has made this request during the FY 05 budget cycle for 1 Environmental Engineer and 2 Environmental Review Specialists.

Traditionally, it has been a challenge to have college interns present which require significant training by engineering staff, and at the same time, this staff must maintain the permitting workload and special project deadlines. There is a substantial learning curve for an engineer to be effective. Normally, it takes an engineer 6 months to become functional due to time spent learning the fundamentals to effectively work in the site plan and permitting process. The engineer would likely leave before or right after they have learned the work. Environmental Compliance will assess the feasibility of participation in the college internship program during the FY 05 budget development periods.

Finding #19: The position title and classification of staff that is currently responsible for conducting Natural Features Inventory (NFI) does not accurately reflect job duties and skill set.

Currently some staff members that are listed as Environmental Review Specialist do not serve the similar purpose of others classified under the same title. The City of Tallahassee Growth Management Department possesses staff with similar job duties and skill sets as those County positions that currently conduct NFI reviews. However, the City of Tallahassee positions have a distinct position classification that recognizes those skills. When reviewed, the job description questionnaire (JDQ) pertaining to the County position of Environmental Review Specialist does not substantially describe the actual duties, functions, and responsibilities of the two positions currently responsible for conducting NFI's. The specialized skill set and job duties should be recognized as a separate and distinct position classification.

Recommendation #19: G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources department, should assess any potential reclassification and/or modification to the current JDQ^{*Note 12.0} of this class, during the FY 2005 budget development period.

(*Note 12.0: The implementation of this recommendation should be considered in conjunction with recommendation number 17.)

G.E.M. Response:

Staff concurs with this recommendation and will pursue reclassification of these positions through Human Resources in the FY 05 cycle.

Finding #20: The minimum salary for the Senior Environmental Engineer, Environmental Review Supervisor, and Environmental Review Specialist positions may not be competitive with the Leon County comparable county market average.

The current Leon County pay grade minimum for the positions of Senior Environmental Engineer, Environmental Review Supervisor, and Environmental Review Specialist are \$43,665, \$48,496 and \$32,625 respectively. As defined by current County policy and the Human Resources department, competitiveness is considered to be at least 5% above competitive market average. In performing a comparative compensation analysis, staff surveyed a combination of "Like-Sized" counties*^{Note 13.0} commonly used in various comparative budget analyses. As a result of these efforts, staff determined that the current pay grade minimums for Senior Environmental Engineer, Environmental Review Supervisor, and Environmental Review Specialist are 15%, 3%, and 6% respectively less than the average pay grade minimum of those entities surveyed.

Recommendation #20: G.E.M., in conjunction with the Human Resources, should assess any potential reclassification of these classes during the FY 2005 budget development period.

(*Note 13.0: Comparable jurisdictions include Alachua County, Collier County, Escambia County, Seminole County, Marion County, and Manatee County).

G.E.M. Response:

Staff concurs with this recommendation, as we have for a number of years, and the Environmental Compliance Specialist position should also be added to the list. We believe that the pay grade minimum for the Environmental Compliance Specialist position may also be below competitive market average. The Environmental Compliance Specialists are responsible for reviewing and approving environmental permits in addition to their inspection and enforcement duties. Environmental Compliance Specialists are also required to have a college degree. Reclassification requests have been submitted for the Senior Environmental Engineer, Environmental Review Supervisor, Environmental Review Specialist, and the Environmental Compliance Specialist.

Furthermore, further research of average pay grade minimums associated with all the referenced positions may reveal that the disparity listed may be even greater than the percentages listed. Market average salary research should be expanded to include: local government, federal, state, water management districts and the private sector.

CONCLUSION

Throughout the program evaluation process staff recognized a serious effort and commitment on the behalf of G.E.M. to provide efficient and effective services. Based on the data provided in the response from M.I.S., staff omitted finding and recommendation #6. Based on the data provided in the response from G.E.M., staff omitted finding and recommendation #10. However, staff does not concur with G.E.M.'s disagreement with findings and recommendations #5, #9, and #11, and as a result, these findings and recommendations are included in the report.